

**Worksheet**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**Bureau of Land Management**

---

**Project Lead:** Shaina Shippen

**Field Office:** Sierra Front Field Office

**Lead Office:** Sierra Front Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** NVN 077129

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2015-0004-DNA

**Project Name:** East Fork Fire District Recreation and Public Purposes Act Lease Renewal

**Applicant Name:** East Fork Fire and Paramedic Districts

**Project Location (County, Township/Range/Section[s]):** Mount Diablo Meridian, Douglas County, Nevada, T. 14 N., R. 20 E., sec. 6, S1/2NE1/4SE1/4SE1/4SE1/4, and SE1/4SE1/4SE1/4SE1/4.

**A. Describe the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

On February 20, 2004, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) issued an Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) Act lease to the Applicant for a fire station and related facilities. The lease contained 3.75 acres of public land in the vicinity of North Sunridge Drive, Douglas County, Nevada. The Applicant developed the lease lands for the approved purposes. The developments included a 12,000 square foot fire station (Fire Station 12) comprising of staff living quarters, volunteer offices, and a training room. On May 4, 2009, the BLM renewed the lease for five (5) years. The renewed lease expired on February 19, 2014. The applicant has timely requested to renew the lease with no additional development purposed.

The BLM would renew the lease for an additional five (5) years. The lease renewal would become effective on February 19, 2014, and expire on February 19, 2019. Following the lease renewal, BLM would recommend the lessee to request patent for the land under the R&PP Act.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance:**

*Carson City Consolidated Resource Management Plan (May 2001)*

*North Douglas County Specific Plan Amendment (June 2001)*

The Proposed Action is in conformance within the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP sections:

North Douglas County Specific Plan Amendment, Section 2.3, Land Tenure Decisions (p. 10):

- “Designate approximately 64 acres of public lands as available for potential disposal to the private sector or local government for recreation and public purposes under provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1954.”

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action:**

Environmental Assessment No. NV-030-0028, *North Douglas County Specific Plan Amendment and Environmental Assessment*, (June 2001);  
Environmental Assessment No. NV-030-02-026, *North Douglas County BLM Land Disposal* (October 2002);  
Determination of NEPA Adequacy No. DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2009-0009-DNA, *Renewal of Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act Lease* (May 2009);  
*Phase I Environmental Site Assessment BLM Land Douglas County, NV* (June 4, 2002);  
*Mineral Report North Douglas County R&PP Lease/Disposal Land Sale Disposal* (September 2002).

#### **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new Proposed Action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in existing NEPA document(s)? If the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes. The lands under the lease and proposed for lease renewal were specifically addressed in the existing NEPA documents. The project is in the same analysis area and there are no differences or changes to address.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes. These lands have been developed for the approved purposes and there are no new environmental concerns, interests, and resources values to address.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listing, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude the new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action?**

Yes. The land under the lease and proposed for lease renewal were developed for the approved purposes and there is no new information or circumstances that would change the analysis of the proposed lease renewal. The project area is not located within sage-grouse general or preliminary habitat or proposed critical habitat for the Bi-State sage-grouse.

**4. Are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new Proposed Action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Yes. The effects that would result from the implementation of the new Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the new Proposed Action?**

Yes. Public involvement and interagency review done prior to leasing was adequate. There is no reason for further public involvement or other review.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Brian Buttazoni	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM
Dan Erbes	Geologist	BLM


Note: refer to the NEPA document(s) for a complete list of team members that participated in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning document(s).

**Conclusion:** Based on the review documented above, I have concluded that this Proposed Action conforms to the LUP and that existing NEPA document(s) fully cover the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Does this DNA constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? ☐ Yes ☒ No

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Project Lead

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leon Thomas  
Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office

ACTING  
FOR